

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office action mailed on April 8, 2009. This paper amends claims 1-10, 17, and 19-31 and cancels claims 11-16 and 18. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment and Response, claims 1-10, 17, and 19-31 will be pending.

I. Objections

The Office action objects to claims 1, 11, 18, 22, and 29 because of informalities, asserting that the term “can be” has not been given patentable weight because it is not a positive limitation. *Office action dated April 8, 2009; page 2.* Amended claims 1, 22, and 29 do not include the term “can be”. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 22, and 29 are not objectionable. This response cancels claims 11 and 18 and the Applicant respectfully submits that the objection is moot with regards to these claims.

The Office action objects to claims 17, 19, and 20 because of informalities, asserting that the term “is capable of” has not been given patentable weight because it is not a positive limitation. *Office action dated April 8, 2009; page 2.* Amended claims 17, 19, and 20 do not include the term “is capable of”. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17, 19, and 20 are not objectionable.

The Office action objects to claims 2-10, 12-16, 18-21, 23-28, and 30-31 because of informalities. This response amends claims 2-10, 19-21, 23-28, and 30-31 and the Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 2-10, 19-21, 23-28, and 30-31 are not objectionable. This response cancels claims 12-16 and 18 and the Applicant respectfully submits that the objection is moot with regards to these claims.

The Office action objects to claim 22 because of informalities. This response amends claim 22 and the Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 22 is not objectionable.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office action asserts that it is not clear who is providing a generic connector interface, who is receiving information related to the information system and where this information is received, who is generating the customized connector interface and where this customized connector is generated, and who is connecting the information system to an application server. *Office action dated April 8, 2009; page 3.* This response amends claim 1, clarifying that the generic connector interface is provided “utilizing an application server”, the information is received “at said application

server”, the customized connector interface is generated “on said application server” “utilizing said application server”, and “said application server” connects “said information system to said application server”. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is definite.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office action rejects claims 1-8, 17, and 19-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Starkovich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,993,585) (“Starkovich”). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

In order for a reference to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the reference must teach each and every element of the claim in a single reference. For at least the following reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that Starkovich does not anticipate any of the claims.

A. Claims 1-8 and 29-31

Amended independent claim 1 recites “receiving information related to an information system at said application server” and “generating...a customized connector interface on said application server, by modifying said generic connector interface, based on said received information.” Claim 29 recites similar limitations. For at least the following reasons, the Assignee respectfully asserts that Starkovich does not disclose the above features.

Starkovich does not teach generating a customized connector interface on an application server by modifying a generic connector interface based on received information related to an information system. The Office action asserts that Starkovich discloses the above limitations, stating Starkovich’s “custom Gateway provides a way for a customer to build customer own gateway to interface own applications.” *Office action dated April 8, 2009; page 3*. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Starkovich merely teaches that a custom gateway provides a way for customers to build their own gateway to interface their own application to an enterprise application. See *Starkovich; col. 8, lines 34-38*. Starkovich discloses libraries that provide framework and functions for building custom gateways and are specifically designed for building custom gateways. See *Starkovich; col. 7, lines 61-64*.

A customer building a custom gateway to interface their own application with an enterprise application does not generate a customized connector interface by modifying a generic connector interface based on received information related to an information system. Rather, the customer just builds a custom gateway for their application utilizing the libraries. The customer, however, does not modify a generic connector interface to generate a customized connector interface. Further, the customer does not modify a generic connector

interface based on information received about an information system to generate a customized connector interface.

In short, Starkovich does not disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 29. As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 29 are not anticipated by Starkovich. Claims 2-8 and 30-31 depend from claims 1 and 29, respectively, and the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-8 and 30-31 are allowable at least due to their dependence on an allowable base claim.

B. Claims 22-28

Amended independent claim 22 recites “receiving one or more properties associated with said information system” and “modifying said Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file, based on said one or more properties, to generate a Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file.” For at least the following reasons, the Assignee respectfully asserts that Starkovich does not disclose the above features.

Starkovich does not teach modifying a generic resource adaptor archive file, based on received properties associated with an information system, to generate a customized resource adaptor archive file. The Office action asserts that Starkovich discloses the above limitations, stating Starkovich’s “the gateway built has a Java Libraries available, using a software development kit for modifying.” *Office action dated April 8, 2009; page 10*. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Starkovich merely teaches that a custom gateway provides a way for customers to build their own gateway to interface their own application to an enterprise application. See *Starkovich; col. 8, lines 34-38*. Starkovich discloses libraries that provide framework and functions for building custom gateways and are specifically designed for building custom gateways. See *Starkovich; col. 7, lines 61-64*. Starkovich also discloses Java Class Libraries that provide class definitions for building JavaGate compatible applets. See *Starkovich; col. 7, lines 65-67*.

A customer building a custom gateway to interface their own application with an enterprise application does not modify a generic resource adapter archive file, based on properties received from an information system, to generate a customized resource adapter archive file. Rather, the customer just builds a custom gateway for their application utilizing the libraries. The customer does not modify a generic resource adapter archive file. Further, the customer does not modify a generic resource adapter archive file based on information received about an information system to generate a customized resource adapter archive file.

Starkovich does not even mention generic resource adapter archive files or customized resource adapter archive files. Starkovich merely mentions Java Class Libraries

that provide class definitions for building JavaGate compatible applets. Starkovich does not mention that the Java Class Libraries include generic resource adapter archive files or customized resource adapter archive files. Moreover, Starkovich discloses that the Java Class Libraries are utilizable for building JavaGate compatible applets, not the customer's custom gateway.

In short, Starkovich does not disclose the limitations of claim 22. As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 is not anticipated by Starkovich. Claims 23-28 depend from claim 22 and the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 23-28 are allowable at least due to their dependence on an allowable base claim.

C. Claims 17 and 19-21

The Office action originally rejected claim 17 (and claims 19-21, which depend from claim 17) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Starkovich. However, this response amends claim 17 to incorporate the limitations of claim 18, which the Office action rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Starkovich in view of Rostoker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,978,319) ("Rostoker"). Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is moot and this response addresses the rejections of claims 17 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

To reach a proper determination under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical "person of ordinary skill in the art" when the invention was unknown and just before it was made. In view of all factual information, the examiner must then make a determination whether the claimed invention "as a whole" would have been obvious at that time to that person. Knowledge of applicant's disclosure must be put aside in reaching this determination, yet kept in mind in order to determine the "differences," conduct the search and evaluate the "subject matter as a whole" of the invention. *See MPEP 2142.*

Amended independent claim 17 recites "a connection interface...operable to connect said application server to a first information system...via said first interface...wherein said connection interface is a configurable interface configurable to connect said application server to a second information system through a second interface which is different from the first interface." For at least the following reasons, the Assignee respectfully asserts that the combination of Starkovich and Rostoker does not disclose the above features.

The Office action correctly admits that Starkovich does not disclose a connector interface that is a "configurable interface that can be configured to connect said application server to a second information system through a second interface which is different from the first interface." *Office action dated April 8, 2009; page 20.* The Office action then cites to column 6, lines 37-47, fig. 6 of Rostoker as disclosing these elements.

However, Rostoker discloses a physical communication cable that utilizes a translation circuit to translate one electrical communication protocol to another electronic communication protocol. *Rostoker; Abstract*. In the portion of Rostoker cited by the Office action, a first interface is connected to a second interface by a controller for the first interface coupled to a controller for the second interface. *Rostoker; col. 6, lines 29-35*. Each of the two interfaces respectively communicate with communications from their respective devices. *Rostoker; col. 6, lines 37-47*. Then, the controllers for the two interfaces translate communications between the two interfaces. *Rostoker; col. 6, lines 37-47*.

Rostoker does not disclose a connection interface operable to connect an application server to a first information system via a first interface, the connection interface configurable to connect the application server to a second information system through a second interface which is different from the first interface. Rostoker merely discloses two different interfaces that communicate via controllers that translate from one interface to another. Rostoker does not disclose that the first interface (which communicates with the second interface) is configurable to connect an application server to a information system through another interface that is different from the second interface. Rostoker also does not disclose that the second interface (which communicates with the first interface) is configurable to connect an application server to a information system through another interface that is different from the first interface.

In short, the combination of Starkovich and Rostoker does not disclose the limitations of claim 17 as a whole. As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is patentable over the combination of Starkovich and Rostoker. Claims 19-21 depend from claim 17 and the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 19-21 are allowable at least due to their dependence on an allowable base claim.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office action rejects claims 9-14, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Starkovich in view of Rostoker. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

A. Claims 11-14, 16, and 18

This response cancels claims 11-14, 16, and 18 and the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is moot with regards to these claims.

B. Claims 9-10

Claims 9-10 depend from claim 1. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Starkovich does not teach or suggest generating a customized connector interface on an

application server by modifying a generic connector interface based on received information related to an information system. Rostoker does not cure the defect of Starkovich because Rostoker discloses a physical communication cable that utilizes a translation circuit to translate one electrical communication protocol to another electronic communication protocol, not generating a customized connector interface on an application server by modifying a generic connector interface based on received information related to an information system. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9-10 are allowable at least due to their dependence on an allowable base claim.

C. Claim 15

The Office action rejects claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Starkovich and Rostoker in view of Theeten (U.S. Patent No. 6,968,553) ("Theeten"). This response cancels claim 15 and the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is moot with regards to this claim.

V. Conclusion

The Assignee thanks the Examiner for his thorough review of the application. The Assignee respectfully submits the present application, as amended, is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowability as soon as practicable.

The Assignee believes no fees or petitions are due with this filing. However, should any such fees or petitions be required, please consider this a request therefor and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1415 as necessary.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or amendment, please contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated: July 7, 2009

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory P. Durbin, Registration No. 42,503
Attorney for Assignee
USPTO Customer No. 66083

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Republic Plaza Building, Suite 4700
370 Seventeenth Street
Denver, Colorado 80202-5647
Phone: (303) 629-3400
Fax: (303) 629-3450